ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成17年度
(第9号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2005

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2006・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2006

The First Three Folios of Manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga*

Diwakar ACHARYA and Noriyuki KUDO

Sylvain Lévi published the *Karmavibhaṅga*[1] first in 1932 from transcriptions of two Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts. He was not able to use the original manuscripts during his actual editorial procedure and the basis of his edition was the transcriptions prepared under the supervision of Hemraj Sharman.[2]

Now the originals have became accessible, and recently one of the authors has published the transliterations of all the Sanskrit manuscripts found in Nepal which were so far available to him.[3] Kudo, however, did not know at that time that the first three folios of the second manuscript (= MS[B]) he transliterated are not lost but are preserved in the same National Archives of Nepal. Diwakar Acharya, working as a member of the Nepal German Manuscripts Preservation Project (later as a Research Assistant of the Nepal German Manuscripts Cataloguing Project), was able to identify and catalogue these folios. These folios were previously deposited in the collection of Hemraj Sharman who had supervised the transcriptions of some Nepalese manuscripts for Sylvain Lévi, but Hemraj Sharman was not aware that these belong to the second manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* of which a transcription was prepared for Lévi even in spite of the fact that he found the second manuscript and informed Lévi of this finding.[4]

Apart from the two manuscripts Lévi and Kudo used for their editions, i.e., manuscripts A and B, there is yet a third manuscript of the text. This new manuscript was also found by Diwakar Acharya; it is written in Newārī script on Nepalese paper, and is incomplete in the available 10 folios.[5] Furthermore he noticed two western notebooks containing the Nāgarī transcription of two original manuscripts respectively in the private library of Hemraj Sharman, probably the same ones he had prepared for

---

[1] Lévi calls the text *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, but Kudo has argued in favour of calling the text simply *Karmavibhaṅga*, see Kudo 2004: viii–xi.

[2] Lévi 1932: 1: "Un peu plus tard, tandis que j'étais au Japon, une lettre de lui — écrite dans ce sanscrit élégant qu'il manie avec une aisance magistrale, m'annonçait la découverte d'un nouveau manuscrit du même texte, et bientôt apres j'en recevais la copie" , cf. also Kudo 2004: vii. As to Hemraj Sharman's personality and activities, see Garzilli 2001.

[3] Kudo 2004: vii.

[4] Lévi op cit.: "... m'annonçait la découverte d'un nouveau manuscrit du même texte, ..."

[5] The third manuscript bearing accession no. 4-951 can be found on NGMPP reel no. A 914/4. A part of this manuscript is transliterated in another paper of this issue, see pp. 43-60.

ARIRIAB Vol. IX (March 2006): 33-42.

Lévi.[6] All of them are preserved in the National Archives and have been filmed by the NGMPP, and are now accessible.

In the following, we will present a transliteration of the three relocated folios of the second manuscript of Lévi's edition. These folios are kept separately and treated as a new manuscript with a new accession no. 5-141, and are filmed by the NGMPP on Reel no. B 22/26. They are slightly damaged at right, left and bottom margins. The appearance of the damage does not correspond to that of other folios of MS[B]: the first three folios are damaged at the right lower corner while the rest of MS[B] is not. It seems to suggest that they might have been kept separately for a long time.

The conventions used in this paper follows Kudo 2004: xv. In the left margins of both pages the pagenumber and line of the above book are given for convenient reference to the reading of MS[A]. In footnotes, we report the variants from the first manuscript (MS [A]) of Lévi's edition. In addition, after inspecting the third manuscript (hereinafter abbrev. MS[E]),[7] we notice that this manuscript in general follows the reading of MS[B]; rather it seems to be, most probably, a direct copy of MS[B]. It is, therefore, significant to include the reading of MS[E] for a reconstruction of the portions where MS[B] is damaged.[8] For the sake of convenience, we use the same brackets Kudo used in his transliteration; we also supply or cancel a punctuation mark, introduce line breaks and arrange the text in paragraphs.[9]

As these folios belong to MS[B], orthography and scribal tendency are already pointed out; we do not repeat here the peculiarity of these folios. However, since these folios preserve the introductory story of the KV and they show consistent readnings in several words which do not correspond to those of MS[A], we would like to indicate some points: this MS generally gives *śaṅkhakukkura* together as a compound, and the same is true with *śukamāṇava*, which is not the case in MS[A][10]; some phrases are omitted but they seem to be redundant in context (see nn. 20 and 27).

---

[6] The transcript of Lévi's MS [A] bears accession no. 5-265 and is filmed on B 94/3, and that of MS[B] bears accession no. 5-263 and can be found on reel no. A 109/9. For the latter, see "Brief Communication" in this issue.

[7] Kudo used abbrev. MS[C] and [D] for the extra folios contained in the same bundle of MS[B] and [A] respectively, see Kudo 2004: 218-224 and 225-227.

[8] For details see the other paper on MS[E] in this issue (pp. 43-60).

[9] See Kudo 2004: xi-xii.

[10] The circumstances of this paper are as follows: Diwakar Acharya found these folios and other materials of the KV; later, in October 2005, he sent his first draft of this paper containing the transliteration of them to Kudo through E-mail. Kudo sent him back the first draft with corrections and suggestions. Later both agreed to publish it under joint authorship. Kudo revised the transliteration and reformulated the layout, and he added the reading of MS[E] by means of the images supplied by Diwakar Acharya.

Transliteration:

(1 recto) *2*[11] karmavibhaṅgasūtra | |[12]

(1v.1) + + .. vajrāya [13] | |

211 evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmiṃ samaye Bhagavān* Śrāvastyām viharati sma | Jetavane Anāthapiṇḍadasyārāme | |

213 atha sa[14] Bhagavā[n pū] .[vā]+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + (1v.2) + + [ya][15] prāvikṣat* sāvadānaṃ Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran*[16] yena Śukamānava[17]○Taudeyaputrasya niveśanan tenopasaṅkrāntas <|>

216 tena khalu punaḥ sama .[e] + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + (1v.3) + + +[18] śaṅkhakukuro[19] goṇikāstṛte paryaṅke niṣaṇṇaḥ | asyāntaropadhāna○yāṃ[20] kāṃsapātryāṃ śālimāṃsodanaṃ paribhuṃkte[21] <|> adrākṣīt* śaṃkhakukuro Bha[ga] .. + + + + + + + + + + + +

4.5 + (1v.4) + + + + [n](*)[22] śaṅkhakukuram[23] etad avocat* |

---

[11] An auspicious symbol, cf. Roth 1986.

[12] This title is written in the middle of the folio. It seems to be quite similar to the title appearing in the colophon.

[13] Read *namo hevajrāya*. The two opening verses in the form of invocation to Buddha and a statement *bhagavatā sūtraṃ bhāṣitam*, which are found in A, are not found in this manuscript. Needless to say, these are original in MS[A] so they are absent also in the Chinese and Tibetan translations.

[14] = MS[E]; [A] omits *sa*.

[15] Read *pū(r)vā(hne nivāsya pātracīvaram ādāya śrāvastīṃ piṇḍā)ya*, cf. MS[E] 1v.1-2: *pūrvāhne nivāsya pā + + + [ram ā]dāya Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya.*

[16] MS[E] reads *piṇḍāya cara**; [A] reads *piṇḍāya caraṇ* (Lévi reads *piṇḍopacaraṇaṃ* and Kudo notes this and remarks that the manuscript reading is a mistake for *caraṇaṃ*).

[17] For °*māṇava*° = MS[E]. It is just possible to retain this compound, but a reading natural to the style of the text would be *Śukasya māṇavasya Taudeyaputrasya* as found in [A].

[18] Read *sama(y)e(na Śukasya māṇavasya Taudeyaputrasya niveśane)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.2.

[19] Read *śaṃkhakukkuro.*

[20] Read °*dhānāyāṃ*. Lévi reads *asmattaropadhānāyāṃ* from MS[A] and corrects it to *aśmantakopadhānāyāṃ*. Kudo suggests to read *aśmāntaropadhānāyāṃ* on the basis of the reading of the third Tibetan translation: *'khar gzhong rdo ba'i khar blangs pa la* | (Phug drag 157b2; London MS Kanjur 200b3-4; sTog Palace 716.2) [Kudo 2004a: 850-849]. However both MS[B] and [E] read *asyāntaropādhānāyāṃ* throughoutly.

[21] MS[A] reads *bhuṅkte*. Then follows in [A]: *Bhagavān adrā(kṣ)īt saṃkhakukura(ḥ) gonikastrate* (*sic.*) *paryaṅke niṣaṇṇa(ḥ)* | | *asmāntaropadhānāyā(ṃ) kāṃsapātryā(ṃ) paribhuṃjānaṃ* |, which is not found in our manuscript and [E]. This line probably is secondary.

[22] Read *Bha[ga](vantaṃ dvāramūle, dṛṣṭvā ca punar bukkati | atha Bhagavā)n*, cf. MS[E] 1v.3.

"etad api te śaṃkha na damayasi[24] ◯ yad api[25] bhokkārād[26] bukkāram āgataḥ <|>"

4.7 evam ukte śaṅkhakukura[27] abhiṣiktaḥ[28] ku[pit]. + + + + + + + + + + (1v.5) + + + + + [ṅkā]d[29] avatīrya adhastāt paryaṅkasya dārusyandanikāyān niṣaṇṇa◯ḥ |

4.10 tena khalu punaḥ samayena Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputrau[30] bahinirgato[31] [']bhūn* <|>kenac[i]d [e]v. k. r. ṇ. yen.[32] <|>

4.12 [athā](1v.6) + + + + + + .. s[33] Taudeyaputraḥ | adrākṣīt* Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputraḥ śaṅkhakukuram[34] adhastāt paryaṅkastha[35] dārusyāndanikāyāṃ[36] niṣarṇṇaṃ[37] dṛṣṭvā ca punar antarjanaṃ āmantrayate |

6.2 "kene;(2r.1) + + + + + + + +[38] k[i]ñcid uktaḥ <|>"[39]

"ko (')smākaṃ āryaputra[40] śaṅkhakukuraṃ[41] kiñcid vakṣati |

6.5 api tv āgato (')bhūt* śramaṇo Gautama[42] dvāramūle dṛṣṭvā ca punar[43] bukkati | tam ena[44] śramaṇo G[au]t. m. ev. m [ā]h.[45] <|>

'(2r.2) + + + + + + .kha n.[46] damayasi[47] yad asi bhokkārād[48] bukkāram āgataḥ | '

---

[23] For *śaṃkhakukkuraṃ*.

[24] = MS[E]; [A] reads *damayati*.

[25] = MS[E]; [A] reads *asi*.

[26] = MS[E]; [A] reads: *bhokārād*.

[27] For °*kukkuro*.

[28] For *śaṃkhakukkuro 'bhiṣiktaḥ*; [A] has *'tiśayitaroṣa*° for *bhiṣiktaḥ kupita*°. This reading most probably is secondary. A standard expression *'bhiṣiktaḥ kupitas caṇḍībhūto 'nāttamanāḥ* appears several times in the subsequent passages in this manuscript and MS[E].

[29] Read *kupit(aś caṇḍībhūto 'nāttamanā goṇikastṛtāt parya)ṅkād*, cf. MS[E]1v.4.

[30] For °*putro*.

[31] For *bahirnirgato* = MS[E] 1v.5; [A] reads: *bahirgato*.

[32] Read *ev(a) k(a)r(a)ṇ(ī)yen(a)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.5: *eva karaṇīyena*.

[33] Read *athā(gataḥ Śuko māṇava)s*. This reading is based on MS[E]: *athāta āgataḥ Śuko māṇavas* (1v.5).

[34] For *śaṃkhakukkuram*.

[35] For *paryaṅkasya*. It is interesting to note that MS[E] has also *paryaṅkastha*, probably a scribal error.

[36] A scribal error for *dārusyandanikāyāṃ*.

[37] For *niṣaṇṇaṃ* = MS[E]; [A] reads instead *prapatitaṃ*.

[38] Read *kenai(vāyaṃ śaṅkhakukkuraṃ)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.6.

[39] MS[E] has *antarjana āha* after this (1v.6).

[40] = MS[E]; [A] reads *'smākaṃ madh(y)e madīyaputraṃ*.

[41] For *śaṃkhakukkuram*.

[42] For *Gautamo*.

[43] MS[A] reads °*mūle 'vasthitaṃ tam ekha* (< *eṣo*); [E] reads °*mūle dṛṣṭvā cāyaṃ punar*.

[44] For *enaṃ*.

[45] Read *Gaut(a)m(a) ev(a)m āh(a)*.

evam uOkte śaṅkhakukkuro 'bhiṣiktaḥ[49] kupita[50] caṇḍībhūta[51] (')nāttamanā[52] goṇikāstṛtāt paryaṅkād avatīryādhastāt paryaṅka(2r.3) + + [ru]syandanikāyān[53] niṣarṇṇaḥ[54] |"

6.11 atha Śukamāṇavas Taudeyaputrau[55] 'bhiOṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍībhūto (')nāttamanā Śrāvastyā niṣkramya[56] yena Jetavanaṃ Anāthapiṇḍadasyārāmes[57] tenopasa (2r.4) + + s[58]

6.14 tena khalu[59] samayena Bhagavān anekaśatāyāṃ bhikṣuparṣadi pura;Ostān niṣaṇṇo dharman deśayati | adrākṣīd Bhagavān* Śukaṃ māṇava[60] Taudeyaputrat*[61] dūrād evāgacchantaṃ dṛṣṭvā ca puna(2r.5) + + ṇām[62] āmantrayate sma ||

8.4 "paśyatha yūyaṃ bhikṣavaḥ ŚukamāṇavaTaudeyaOputreṃ[63] dūrād evāgacchantaṃ <|>"

"evaṃ Bhagavaṃ |"

8.7 "sacet* Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro (')smiṃ sama[y]e [k]ā[l]aṃ k. r[y]ād[64] yathā (2r.6) + +.[i]kṣiptaḥ[65] | evaṃ kāyasya bhedāt paraṃ maraṇād apāyadurgatiṃ vinipātan[66] narakeṣūpapadyate | tathā hy anena mamāntike citta[67] pradūṣitaṃ <|> cittapradūṣaṇa[68] he[to] + + + + + + + + + (2v.1) + +[t[69]

---

46 Read *(etarhy api tvaṃ śaṅ)kha na*, cf. MS[E] 1v.7; [A] reads *etad api te saṃkha na*.

47 = MS[E]; [A] reads *damayati*.

48 = MS[E]; [A] reads *bhokārād*.

49 = MS[E]; [A] reads *'tiśayitaḥ*.

50 For *kupita(ś)*.

51 For *caṇḍībhūto*.

52 For *kupitaś caṇḍībhūto 'nāttamanā*.

53 Read *paryaṅka(sya dā)ru°*, cf. MS[E] (although it reads *paryaṅkastha*).

54 For *niṣaṇṇaḥ*.

55 For *°putro*; *Taudeyaputro* has been dropped in [A].

56 MS[A] reads *{goṇikā}<<n na>>ṣkramya*. Kudo assumes that several words have been omitted here and suggests a long sentence making pair with a later passage ([A] 6r.5-v.1) to insert, and says that "at the very least *Śrāvastyān* is necessary" [Kudo 2004: 6, fn. 16]. MS[E] reads *Śrāvastyāṃ niṣkramya* (1v.9).

57 For *°ārāmas*.

58 Read *tenopasa(kranta)s*.

59 MS[A] and [E] read *tena khalu punaḥ*.

60 For *māṇavaṃ*; [A] reads *māṇavakaṃ*.

61 A scribal error for *°putram*.

62 Read *puna(r bhikṣū)ṇ{āṃ}*, cf. MS[E] 1v.10: *punar bhikṣūnāṃ*; [A]: *<<pu(na)r bhikṣū>>ṇ*. See also [B]4r.4; [A]6v.2; [E]3r.2.

63 A scribal error for *°putraṃ*; MS[E] reads *Śukaṃ māṇavaṃ Taudeyaputraṃ* (1v.10).

64 Read *k(u)ryād*.

65 Read *(bhallo n)ikṣiptaḥ*.

66 MS[E] reads *°durgativinipātaṃ* (1v.11); [A] reads *°durgativinipāte 'vīcau*.

67 For *cittaṃ*.

pa]ram maraṇād apāyadurgatiṃ vinipātan[70] narakeṣūpapadyante ||"

8.13 athānyatamo bhikṣus tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthā[71] bhāṣate ||

8.14 praduṣṭacittaṃ dṛṣṭvaiva ekadyam[72] iha pudgalaṃ <|>
et. + + + + + + + + + + (2v.2) + +[73] ke ||
idānīṃ bata doṣo (')yaṃ[74] kālaṃ kurvīta māṇava[75] <|>
narakeṣūpapadya;Ote[76] cittaṃ hy etena dūṣitaṃ ||
10.1 yathā hy ucitaṃ nikṣiptaṃ evam eva tathāgate ||
cittapradūṣaṇa[he]. [o] .. + .. .[ti][77] [d]u g. [ti][78] <||>

10.3 (2v.3) + + [Śu]ko[79] māṇavas Taudeyaputro yena Bhagavān*s[80] tenopasaṃkrānta upaOsaṃkramya Bhagavatā sārddhaṃ saṃmukhaṃ saṃmodanī saṃrañjanī[81] vividhāṅ kathāṃ vyatisāryaikānte niṣarṇṇaḥ[82] | Śuko mā(2v.4) + + [s][83] Taudeyaputrau[84] Bhagavantam idam avocat* |
10.8 "āgamad[85] bhavān Gautama[86] aOsmākan niveśanam <|>"
"āgamat[87] māṇavaḥ[88] <|>"
"mā bhavatā[89] Gautamena{ṃ}[90] śaṅkhakukkura[91] kiñcid uktaḥ <|>"

---

[68] MS[A]: °*d(ū)ṣaṇād dheto*; [E]: °*dūṣaṇā(d) hetor*.

[69] Read *heto(r evam ihaike satvāḥ kāyabhedā)[t]*, cf. [E]1v.11-2r.1.

[70] MS[A]: °*durgatāvīcau* (Kudo thinks that it is a scribal error for °*durgatyavicau*); [E]: °*durgati*°.

[71] For *gāthā(ṃ)*.

[72] For *ekatyam*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

[73] Read *et(am artham vyākārṣīc chāstā bhikṣugaṇānti)ke*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

[74] = MS[E] 2r.1; [A] reads *batādhikṣepaṃ*; Lévi reads *batāvikṣepaṃ*.

[75] For *māṇavaḥ*.

[76] = MS[E]; [A] reads °*padyete* (< °*padyeta*. The reason is that it is originally written as °*padyate* but insufficiently corrected as °*padyete*).

[77] Read °*dūṣaṇaheto(ḥ satvā gacchant)ti*, cf. MS[E]: °*dūṣaṇahetos sa<tvā> gacchanti* (2r.2); [A] reads °*dūṣaṇād dhetoḥ satvā gacchanti*.

[78] Read *du(r)g(a)ti(ṃ)*.

[79] Read (*atha*) *Śuko*, cf. MS[E]; [A] has *athādhikṣepya*.

[80] For *Bhagavāṃs*. [A] has *Bhagavāṃ*.

[81] For *saṃmodanīṃ saṃrañjanīṃ*, cf. MS[E]; [A] has *saṃmodanīyāṃ sarajanīyāṃ*.

[82] For *niṣaṇṇaḥ*.

[83] Read *mā(ṇava)s*.

[84] For °*putro*.

[85] = MS[E]; [A] reads *āgato*.

[86] = MS[E]; [A] reads *Gautamau* (< *Gautamo*).

[87] A usage of the third person singular for the first person singular (according to Diwakar Acharya). MS[A] has *āgamaṇa* (< *āgamanaṃ*).

[88] Read *māṇava* as in MS[A] and [E].

"ihāhaṃ māṇava pū;(2v.5) + + + .. [sya][92] pātracīvaram ādāya Śrāvastīṃ piṇḍāya prāvikṣat* <|> sāOvadānaṃ Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran yena tava[93] niveśanaṃs tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ <|> upāsaṃkramya[94] dvāramūle sthita[95] (2v.6) + + + + + + + +[96] śaṅkhakukkuro goṇikāstṛte mañcake (')dhiruhe (')syāntaropadhānāyāṃ[97] kāṃsa{ṃ}pātryāṃ śālimāṃsodana[98] paribhuṅkte | adrākṣīc chaṃkhakukkurau[99] māṃ dvāramūle sthitan[100] dṛṣṭvā ;(3r.1) + + + + + + + + + + [v].[101] vadāmi |

12.2 'etad api śaṅkha na damayasi[102] yad api[103] bhokkārād bukāram āgataḥ |'

evam ukte śaṅkhakukkuro 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍībhūto (')nāttamanā goṇikāstṛtāt paryaṅkād avatīryā(3r.2) + + + + + +[104] .[ā]rusyandanikāyāṃ[105] niṣaṇṇaḥ |"

12.7 "kiṃ punar bhavān*[106] Gautama{ḥ} śaṃkhaOkukkurom[107] asmākaṃ pūrvasyāṃ[108] jānīte |"

12.9 "alaṃ māṇava tiṣṭha mā me etaṃ[109] arthaṃ paripṛākṣīt[110] mā te bhaviṣyati āghatāś cākṣānti;(3r.3) + + + s[o][111] daurmaṇasyaṃ <|>"

12.11 dvir api trir api Śuko māṇavas Taudevaputro BhagavaOntam etad avocat* <|>

12.12 "kiṃ[112] punar bha{{ga}}vān*[113] Gautamau[114] 'smākaṃ śaṅkhakukkuraṃ

---

[89] MS[A] reads {{*māṇava*}} *bhagavatā*.

[90] = MS[E] 2r.4.

[91] For °*kukkuraṃ*.

[92] Read *pū(rvāhṇe nivā)sya*, cf. MS[E] 2r.4.

[93] = MS[E]; [A] reads *bhagavat atra* (< *bhavato 'tra*).

[94] For *upasaṃkramya*.

[95] = MS[E]; [A] reads °*mūle 'vasthitaḥ*.

[96] Read (*āsāṃ* | *tadāsan māṇava te*) on the basis of MS[E] 2r.5; [A] reads *tena khalu puna(r) samaye*.

[97] = MS[E]; [A] has *'dhirūḍho 'smāntaro*°.

[98] For °*danaṃ*.

[99] For °*kukkuro*.

[100] = MS[E]; [A] reads *'vasthitaṃ*.

[101] Read (*bukkāram akarot tadāham e*)*va* on the basis of the reading in MS[E]2r.6: *bukkarim* [< *bukkāram*] *akarot tadāham eva*; [A] reads *ca punar bukkati* | *taṃ enam evaṃ*.

[102] = MS[E]; [A] reads *damayati*.

[103] = MS[E]; [A] reads *asi*.

[104] Read *avatīryā(dhastāt paryaṅkasya)*, cf. MS[E]2r.7.

[105] Read (*d*)*ārusyandanikāyāṃ*.

[106] = MS[E]; [A] reads *Bhagavān*.

[107] A scribal error for °*kukkuram*. MS[A] reads here: *śaṃkhasya kuk(k)urasyāsmākaṃ*.

[108] Both MS[A] and [E] have *jātan* after *pūrvasya*.

[109] = MS[E]; [A] reads *tam*.

[110] MS[E]2r.8: *paripṛākṣīr*; [A]4v.3: *paripṛākṣīt**.

[111] Read °(*ś ca ceta*)*so*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

[112] MS[A] omits *kiṃ*.

pūrvikāyāṃ jātau saṃjānīte <|>"

12.14 "alam māṇava ti;(3r.4) + +[m].[115] tam artham pariprākṣīt[116] mā te[117] bhaviṣyati āghātaś cākṣāntiś ca ceta◯so daurmanasyaṃ |"

14.2 arddhā va[118] māṇava yāvat trir apy etam arthenālabdhās[119]

"tena hi māṇava śṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru bhā(3r.5) + +[120] | yas te māṇava pitā Taudeyaḥ sa eva[121] kāyasya bhedād dhināyāṃ[122] śvāyo◯nāv[123] upapannaḥ <|>"

14.6 "kim etat tu[124] bho Gautama eva[125] bhaviṣyati asmākaṃ pitā Taudeya[126] iṣṭayajña [āhi] .[ā] .[ir] .[c]. [itay]. [pa]ḥ[127] (3r.6) + + + ..[128] kāyasya bhedāc chubhe[129] brahmaloke upapannau[130] bhaviṣyati <|>"

14.9 "anenaiva te māṇava mānābhimānena pitā Taudeyo hīnāyāṃ[131] śvānayonāv[132] upapanno pi tu[133] māṇava ya[di] + + + + + + + + + + na[134] (3v.1) + + .. ṇava[135] yena svakan niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrāma upasaṃkramya śaṅkhakukkuram evaṃ vada <|>

14.13 'saced bhavāc[136] chaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt

---

[113] MS[E] reads *bhavān**; [A] reads *bhagavān*.

[114] For *Gautamo*, cf. MS[E].

[115] Read *ti(ṣṭha mā)* [*m*](*e*), cf. MS[A] and [E].

[116] MS[E]2r.9: *pariprākṣīr*; [A]4v.4-5: *pariprākṣīn*.

[117] = MS[E]; [A] reads *mā ih(') eva ca te*.

[118] = MS[E]. For *addhā ca* ("in this way"). [A] has *anyathā tvaṃ*.

[119] MS[A] reads *artha(ṃ) ṇā* .. .. (Diwakar Acharya suggests to read: *artham ālabdhas*).

[120] Read *bhā(ṣiṣye)*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

[121] = MS[E]; [A] reads *eṣa*.

[122] For *dhīnāyāṃ*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

[123] Is this a mere scribal error for *śvānayonāv* as found in MS[E]? MS[A] reads *śvayonāv*. See [E]3r.6 below, and fn. 132.

[124] Both MS [A] and [E] omit *tu*.

[125] For *evaṃ*, cf. MS[E].

[126] = MS[E]; [A] has *ca yonau* instead of *Taudeya*.

[127] Read *āhi(t)ā(gn)ir (u)c(chr)itay(ū)paḥ*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

[128] Read (*sa niyataṃ)* on the basis of MS[E] 2v.1; [A] reads *saṃnīyataṃ*. Lévi edits this word as *sannīyate* and Edgerton includes it as a sole example of MIndic passive form of *saṃ-√jñā-*. However, on the basis of the reading of MS[A] Kudo doubts this reading and explanation although he could not offer any conclusive comment on this word, cf. Kudo 2004a: 847-846. Here "*sa niyatam*" means "He, inevitably ...."

[129] = MS[E]. For *chubbre* as found in [A].

[130] For *upapanno*; A *upapano*.

[131] = MS[E]; [A] reads *mahādānapati(r)*.

[132] = MS[E]; [A] reads *śvayonāv*, cf. fn. 123.

[133] Read (')*pi tu*, cf. MS[E]; [A] reads '*pitur* (Kudo suggested to read "*upapannaḥ | pitur*" [Kudo 2004: 14, fn. 13] but this reading should be changed as in [E]).

[134] Read (*me bhāṣitaṃ na śraddadhāsi te*)*na*.

[135] Read (*hi tvaṃ mā*)*ṇava*.

Taudeya adhirohatu[137] [go] + + + + + + +'[138]

14.15 + + + .. [te][139] | | (3v.2) + + + haṃ[140] cainam evam vada

14.16 'saced bhavāc[141] chaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jā;Otau pitābhūt Taudeyaḥ paribhuṃjīta bhavān asyāntaropadhānāyāṃ[142] kāṃsapātryāṃ śālimāṃso[d]. [n].[143] + + + [kṣ]. te[144] |'

16.3 bhuktava(3v.3) + +[na]m[145] evam vada <|>

16.4 'saced bhavāc[146] chaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau piOtābhūt Taudeya puttau[147] 'smākaṃ maraṇasamaye satta[148] svāpateyaṃ nopadarśitan tad upadarśaya'

upadarśayiṣyati |"

16.8 atha Śu(3v.4) + + ṇavas[149] Taudeyaputro Bhagavato[150] bhāṣitam udgṛhya paryavāpya yena svaOkaṃ niveśanan tenopasaṃkrānta upasaṅkramya saṅkhakukkuram idam[151] avocat* |

16.11 "saced bhavān śaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pū(3v.5) + + + + .[au][152] pitābhūt Taudeya[153] adhiroha[154] goṇikāstṛtaṃ paryaṇkam <|>"

18.1 adhiru;Ohaṃ[155] cainam evam āha |

18.2 "saced bhavān* śaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Taudeyaḥ paribhuñjatu[156] bhavān* (3v.6) + + + + + + + ..ṃ[157] [kāṃ]sapātryāṃ śālimāṃsodanam paribhuktavāṅ"

---

[136] For *bhavāñc*.

[137] = MS[E]; [A] reads *adhiroha*.

[138] Read *go(ṇikāstṛtaṃ paryaṅkaṃ)*.

[139] Read *(adhiro)[kṣate]*; both MS[A] and [E] read *adhirokṣati*.

[140] Read *(adhiru)haṃ*, cf. MS[E]; [A] has *adhirūḍhaṃ*.

[141] For *bhavāñc*.

[142] = MS[E]; [A] has *asmāntaro°*.

[143] Read *śālimāṃsod(a)n(aṃ)*.

[144] Read *(paribho)kṣate*, cf. MS[E]; [A] reads *paribhokṣyate*.

[145] Read *bhuktava(ntaṃ cai)nam*.

[146] For *bhavāñc*.

[147] *Taudeyaputro*? Probably a wrong reading for *Taudeyaḥ yat te*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

[148] = MS[E]; for *santaṃ*. [A] has *mama satuṃ* (< *santaṃ*).

[149] Read *Śu(ko mā)ṇavas*.

[150] = MS[E]; [A] reads *bhagavātā* (< *bhagavatā*).

[151] = MS[E]; [A] reads *etad*.

[152] Read *pū(rvikāyāṃ jāt)au*.

[153] For *Taudeyaḥ*.

[154] = MS[A]; [E] reads *'dhirohatu* (2v.7).

[155] MS[A]: *adhirūḍhaṃ*; [E]: *adhirūḍho 'dhiruhaṃ*.

[156] An unfinished *akṣara* between *bhu* and *ñja* is cancelled.

[157] Read *(asyāntaropādhānāyā)ṃ*, cf. MS[E]; [A] reads *āsmātaro<pa>dhānāyāṃ*.

18.5 bhuktavantaṃ[158] caina{{ṃ}}m evam āha |

18.6 "saced bhavāc[159] chaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Taudeya yatto[160] 'smāka[161] maraṇasamaye[162] sa(4r.1) + + + + + + + +[rśitaṃ][163] tad upadarśaya | "

References :

Edgerton, Franklin

1953 *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. 1: Grammar, vol.2: Dictionary, New Haven.

Garzilli, Enrica

2001 "A Sanskrit Letter Written by Sylvain Lévi in 1923 to Hemaraja Śarmā along with Hitherto Unknown Bibliographical Notes (Cultural Nationalism and Internationalism in the First Half of the 20th Century: Famous Indologists Write to the Raj Guru of Nepal—No. 1)," in: *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* XII, pp. 115-150.

Kudo, Noriyuki

2004 *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal.* (BPPB VII) Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

2004a 「*Mahākarmavibhaṅga* 写本再読による「仏教梵語」語彙の再考察」『印度學佛教學研究』 52-2, pp. 850-845. ("Some Remarks on the Buddhist Sanskrit Vocabularies found in Two Nepalese Manuscripts of the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*," in: *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [= *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*] 52-2, pp. 850-845(L)).

Lévi, Sylvain

1932 *Mahakarmavibhaṅga (a Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga), texts sanscrits rapportés du Nepal, édités et traduits aves les textes parallèles en sanscrit, en pali en tibètan, en chinois et en kutchéen*, Paris: ibrairie Ernst Leroux.

NAK Catalogue The Unpublished Handwritten Master-catalogue of the National Archives Kathmandu in Six Volumes, vol. 3.

Roth, Gustav

1968 "Maṅgala-Symbols in Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts and Inscriptions," in: *Deyadharma. Studies in Memory of Dr. D. C. Sircar*, ed. by G. Bhattacharya, Delhi, pp. 239-250.

(This research is supported in part by a Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C)(2) from JSPS)

[Keywords] *Karmavibhaṅga*, Nepalese manuscript, Sylvain Lévi, NGMPP

[158] = MS[E]; [A] reads *bhuktanta(ṃ)*.

[159] For *bhavāñc*.

[160] *Taudeyaputro*? Probably a wrong reading for *Taudeyaḥ yat te*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

[161] For *asmāka(ṃ)*.

[162] MS[A] adds *mama*.

[163] Read *sa(ntaṃ svāpateyaṃ nopada)rśitaṃ*.